



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/661,504	09/15/2003	Takaaki Sugiyama	117140	7408
25944	7590	11/02/2009	EXAMINER	
OLIFF & BERRIDGE, PLC P.O. BOX 320850 ALEXANDRIA, VA 22320-4850				CHEN, QING
ART UNIT		PAPER NUMBER		
2191				
MAIL DATE		DELIVERY MODE		
11/02/2009		PAPER		

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	10/661,504	SUGIYAMA, TAKAAKI	
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	Qing Chen	2191	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 30 June 2009.

2a) This action is **FINAL**. 2b) This action is non-final.

3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4) Claim(s) 1,4,6-8 and 10 is/are pending in the application.

4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5) Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.

6) Claim(s) 1,4,6-8 and 10 is/are rejected.

7) Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.

8) Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10) The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner.

Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).

11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).

a) All b) Some * c) None of:

1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

1) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)	4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413)
2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)	Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ .
3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)	5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____ .	6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____ .

DETAILED ACTION

1. This Office action is in response to the amendment filed on June 30, 2009.
2. **Claims 1, 4, 6-8, and 10** are pending.
3. **Claims 1 and 7** have been amended.
4. **Claims 2, 3, 5, and 9** have been canceled.
5. The objections to Claims 1, 4, and 6 are withdrawn in view of Applicant's amendments to the claims.
6. The 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph, rejections of Claims 7, 8, and 10 are withdrawn in view of Applicant's amendments to the claims.

Response to Amendment

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

7. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

8. **Claims 1, 4, 7, and 8** are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over **US 2002/0052796** (hereinafter “**Tadokoro**”) in view of **US 6,092,088** (hereinafter “**Takeda**”).

As per **Claim 1**, Tadokoro discloses:

- a service acquisition unit that acquires plural services available to a user by using user information, wherein the user information is updated when at least one of the plural services is selected, and the plural services available to the user being determined by the content of a restriction value table expressing restrictions on execution of services and values of the user information are checked against values of the restriction value table (*see Figure 4: 301; Figures 6 and 8; Paragraph [0056]*, “*Each user, who is a customer of services provided by the systems in this embodiment can access the service providing system 101 by executing the service access program 311, e.g. browser, in his/her service access apparatus so as to receive a desired service therefrom.*”; *Paragraph [0059]*, “*The system in this embodiment further enables the user of a service access apparatus 301, which is a customer of the system, to use the services of a company cooperated with the service providing company that operates this service providing system 101 in addition to the services provided by the service providing system 101.*” and “*... the user can receive a service of the cooperated company just like a service provided from the service providing system 101 without knowing the difference.*”; *Paragraph [0063]*, “*FIG. 6 is a configuration of the service information classified by user 132 stored in the data memory 117 of the service providing system 101. The service information classified by user 132 is a table for storing information denoting services accessible, i.e., allowed for use by the user. The service information classified by user 132 includes fields of user code 601, service code 602, service name 603, service user code 604, and service user name 605.*”; *Paragraph [0068]*, “*The common information of state 134 is a table for storing information related to the services (including not only common services, but also services classified by area and by cooperated company) used by all the users. The common information of state 134 includes fields of user*

code 801, service code 802, cooperated company user code 803, state code 804, and service providing time 805.”; Paragraph [0069], “The state code 804 stores the various states that occur when the user uses a service. For example, the state code 804 stores such states as login and logout, or start and end. The service providing time 805 stores a time at which the subject state occurs.”);

- a cooperation instruction information creation unit that creates the cooperation instruction information by using the plural services acquired by the service acquisition unit (see Figure 4: 311); and

- a display unit that displays a service list, the service list including a list of the plural services available to the user which the user can use at present (see Figure 3: 317; Figure 12; Paragraph [0077], “FIG. 12 shows an example of the screen svc01 for starting the common service to be displayed on the display block 317 of the service access apparatus 301.”;

Paragraph [0079], “In FIG. 12, numeral 1220 denotes the common service announcement field and 1230 denotes the service announcement field classified by area.”),

- wherein each of the plural services performs specific processing on data (see Figure 12),

- the service acquisition unit acquires at least one of the plural services available to the user for each of functions constituting a job flow that is created and the cooperation instruction information creation unit provides for selection of at least one of the plural services available to the user corresponding to each of the functions (see Figures 11-18; Paragraph [0074], “FIGS. 11 through 17 show examples of the service access screen displayed at the system in this embodiment. FIG. 18 shows an example of the processing order of management of service

providing in the system in this embodiment. Hereinafter, a description will be made for each screen displayed on the display block 317 of the service access apparatus 301 when processings are executed sequentially in the order shown in FIG. 18.”), and

- the plural services available to the user and the user information are updated with each selection (see *Figure 8; Paragraph [0069]*, “*The state code 804 stores the various states that occur when the user uses a service. For example, the state code 804 stores such states as login and logout, or start and end. The service providing time 805 stores a time at which the subject state occurs.*”).

However, Tadokoro does not disclose:

- plural services for a document;
- data related to the document; and
- a job flow for the document.

Takeda discloses:

- plural services for a document (see *Figure 1; Column 2: 39-57*, “*A system consisting of the PC 132, the scanner unit 103 and the printer unit 104 has a simple copy function for printing the image read by the scanner unit 103 with the printer unit 104 in response to the operation of the PC 132.*” and “*Therefore, the copy machine 121 receives the document or the like formed by the PC 131 or 132 through the LAN 111 as image formation command data, develops the image included in the image formation command data into bit map image data, and then prints the obtained data.*”);
- data related to the document (see *Figure 1; Column 2: 39-57*, “*A system consisting of the PC 132, the scanner unit 103 and the printer unit 104 has a simple copy function for printing*

the image read by the scanner unit 103 with the printer unit 104 in response to the operation of the PC 132.” and “Therefore, the copy machine 121 receives the document or the like formed by the PC 131 or 132 through the LAN 111 as image formation command data, develops the image included in the image formation command data into bit map image data, and then prints the obtained data.”); and

- a job flow for the document (see Figure 1; Column 2: 39-57, “A system consisting of the PC 132, the scanner unit 103 and the printer unit 104 has a simple copy function for printing the image read by the scanner unit 103 with the printer unit 104 in response to the operation of the PC 132.” and “Therefore, the copy machine 121 receives the document or the like formed by the PC 131 or 132 through the LAN 111 as image formation command data, develops the image included in the image formation command data into bit map image data, and then prints the obtained data.”).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to incorporate the teaching of Takeda into the teaching of Tadokoro to modify Tadokoro’s invention to include plural services for a document; data related to the document; and a job flow for the document. The modification would be obvious because one of ordinary skill in the art would be motivated to provide various services for processing document data.

As per **Claim 4**, the rejection of **Claim 1** is incorporated; and Tadokoro further discloses:

- an inquiry unit that inquires of respective service processing devices each storing a restriction value table expressing restrictions on execution of services, by transmitting user

information, as to whether the user can use the services of the respective service processing devices (*see Figure 4: 301; Figure 10; Paragraph [0059]*, “*The system in this embodiment further enables the user of a service access apparatus 301, which is a customer of the system, to use the services of a company cooperated with the service providing company that operates this service providing system 101 in addition to the services provided by the service providing system 101.*”; *Paragraph [0072]*, “*FIG. 10 is a configuration of the user information of cooperated company 231 stored in the data memory 217 of the service providing system 101. The user information of cooperated company 231 is a table for storing preset items of user code and password with which the service providing system of cooperated company 201 accepts an access. The user information of cooperated company 231 includes fields of user code of cooperated company 1001, password of cooperated company 1002, account holder code of cooperated company 1003, and account holder name of cooperated company 1004.*”),

- wherein the service acquisition unit acquires the plural services on the basis of an inquiry result of the inquiry unit (*see Paragraph [0056]*, “*Each user, who is a customer of services provided by the systems in this embodiment can access the service providing system 101 by executing the service access program 311, e.g. browser, in his/her service access apparatus so as to receive a desired service therefrom.*”; *Paragraph [0059]*, “*The system in this embodiment further enables the user of a service access apparatus 301, which is a customer of the system, to use the services of a company cooperated with the service providing company that operates this service providing system 101 in addition to the services provided by the service providing system 101.*”).

However, Tadokoro does not disclose:

- service processing devices for the document; and
- plural services for the document.

Takeda discloses:

- service processing devices for a document (*see Figure 1: 103, 104, 121, and 132*);

and

- plural services for the document (*see Figure 1; Column 2: 39-57, “A system consisting of the PC 132, the scanner unit 103 and the printer unit 104 has a simple copy function for printing the image read by the scanner unit 103 with the printer unit 104 in response to the operation of the PC 132.” and “Therefore, the copy machine 121 receives the document or the like formed by the PC 131 or 132 through the LAN 111 as image formation command data, develops the image included in the image formation command data into bit map image data, and then prints the obtained data.”*).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to incorporate the teaching of Takeda into the teaching of Tadokoro to modify Tadokoro’s invention to include service processing devices for the document; and plural services for the document. The modification would be obvious because one of ordinary skill in the art would be motivated to provide various services for processing document data.

Claim 7 is a cooperation instruction information creation method claim corresponding to the cooperation instruction information creation device claim above (Claim 1) and, therefore, is rejected for the same reason set forth in the rejection of Claim 1.

As per **Claim 8**, the rejection of **Claim 7** is incorporated; and Tadokoro further discloses:

- wherein in the cooperation instruction information creation step, services constituting the job flow are selected from the acquired plural services, and the cooperation instruction information is created by using the selected services (*see Figures 11-18; Paragraph [0074], “FIGS. 11 through 17 show examples of the service access screen displayed at the system in this embodiment. FIG. 18 shows an example of the processing order of management of service providing in the system in this embodiment. Hereinafter, a description will be made for each screen displayed on the display block 317 of the service access apparatus 301 when processings are executed sequentially in the order shown in FIG. 18.”*).

However, Tadokoro does not disclose:

- a job flow for the document; and
- plural services for the document.

Takeda discloses:

- a job flow for a document (*see Figure 1; Column 2: 39-57, “A system consisting of the PC 132, the scanner unit 103 and the printer unit 104 has a simple copy function for printing the image read by the scanner unit 103 with the printer unit 104 in response to the operation of the PC 132.” and “Therefore, the copy machine 121 receives the document or the like formed by the PC 131 or 132 through the LAN 111 as image formation command data, develops the image included in the image formation command data into bit map image data, and then prints the obtained data.”*); and

- plural services for the document (*see Figure 1; Column 2: 39-57, “A system consisting of the PC 132, the scanner unit 103 and the printer unit 104 has a simple copy*

function for printing the image read by the scanner unit 103 with the printer unit 104 in response to the operation of the PC 132.” and “Therefore, the copy machine 121 receives the document or the like formed by the PC 131 or 132 through the LAN 111 as image formation command data, develops the image included in the image formation command data into bit map image data, and then prints the obtained data.”).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to incorporate the teaching of Takeda into the teaching of Tadokoro to modify Tadokoro’s invention to include a job flow for the document; and plural services for the document. The modification would be obvious because one of ordinary skill in the art would be motivated to provide various services for processing document data.

9. **Claims 6 and 10** are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over **Tadokoro** in view of **Takeda** as applied to Claims 1 and 7 above, and further in view of **US 6,851,115 (hereinafter “Cheyer”)**.

As per **Claim 6**, the rejection of **Claim 1** is incorporated; however, Tadokoro does not disclose:

- wherein the service acquisition unit determines and acquires a service for the document having minimum restrictions for each of the functions constituting the job flow for the document, and the cooperation instruction information creation unit creates the cooperation instruction information by associating the respective plural services for the document acquired

by the service acquisition unit with the respective functions constituting the job flow for the document.

Takeda discloses:

- plural services for a document (see *Figure 1; Column 2: 39-57*, “*A system consisting of the PC 132, the scanner unit 103 and the printer unit 104 has a simple copy function for printing the image read by the scanner unit 103 with the printer unit 104 in response to the operation of the PC 132.*” and “*Therefore, the copy machine 121 receives the document or the like formed by the PC 131 or 132 through the LAN 111 as image formation command data, develops the image included in the image formation command data into bit map image data, and then prints the obtained data.*”); and

- a job flow for the document (see *Figure 1; Column 2: 39-57*, “*A system consisting of the PC 132, the scanner unit 103 and the printer unit 104 has a simple copy function for printing the image read by the scanner unit 103 with the printer unit 104 in response to the operation of the PC 132.*” and “*Therefore, the copy machine 121 receives the document or the like formed by the PC 131 or 132 through the LAN 111 as image formation command data, develops the image included in the image formation command data into bit map image data, and then prints the obtained data.*”).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to incorporate the teaching of Takeda into the teaching of Tadokoro to modify Tadokoro’s invention to include plural services for the document; and a job flow for the document. The modification would be obvious because one of ordinary skill in the art would be motivated to provide various services for processing document data.

Cheyer discloses:

- wherein a service acquisition unit determines and acquires a service having minimum restrictions for each of the functions constituting a job flow, and a cooperation instruction information creation unit creates cooperation instruction information by associating respective plural services acquired by the service acquisition unit with the respective functions constituting the job flow (*see Column 15: 66 and 67 to Column 16: 1-17, “Advice parameters preferably give constraints or guidance to the facilitator in completing and interpreting the goal. For example, a solution_limit parameter preferably allows the requester to say how many solutions it is interested in; the facilitator and/or service providers are free to use this information in optimizing their efforts. Similarly, a time_limit is preferably used to say how long the requester is willing to wait for solutions to its request ... ”; Column 16: 39-43, “In a preferred embodiment of the present invention, when a facilitator receives a compound goal, its job is to construct a goal satisfaction plan and oversee its satisfaction in an optimal or near optimal manner that is consistent with the specified advice.” and 62-67 to Column 17: 1 and 2, “With further reference to FIG. 7, each registered agent may be optionally associated with one or more capabilities, which have associated Capability Declaration fields 708 in the parent facilitator Agent Registry 702. These capabilities may define not just functionality, but may further provide a utility parameter indicating, in some manner (e.g., speed, accuracy, etc), how effective the agent is at providing the declared capability.”*).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to incorporate the teaching of Cheyer into the teaching of Tadokoro to modify Tadokoro’s invention to include wherein the service acquisition unit determines and

acquires a service having minimum restrictions for each of the functions constituting the job flow, and the cooperation instruction information creation unit creates the cooperation instruction information by associating the respective plural services acquired by the service acquisition unit with the respective functions constituting the job flow. The modification would be obvious because one of ordinary skill in the art would be motivated to provide an optimal or near optimal job flow for processing document data (*see Cheyer – Column 16: 39-43*).

Claim 10 is rejected for the same reason set forth in the rejection of Claim 6.

Response to Arguments

10. Applicant's arguments filed on June 30, 2009 have been fully considered, but they are not persuasive.

In the Remarks, Applicant argues:

a) Claim 1 recites, a service acquisition unit that acquires plural services for a document available to a user by using user information, claim 7 recites similar as a method step. The Office Action asserts that Tadokoro discloses a service acquisition trait that acquires plural services. As discussed above, these services are for a user and not for a document. The Office Action asserts that Takeda discloses plural services for a document. The services obtained by Tadokoro would not have been services for any document. At least the above features cannot reasonably be considered to have been suggested by the combination of the applied references.

Examiner's response:

a) Examiner disagrees. With respect to the Applicant's assertion that it would not have been predictable to combine Tadokoro with Takeda in the manner suggested by the Office action, the Examiner respectfully submits that by combining the teaching of Takeda into the teaching of Tadokoro, one of ordinary skill in the art would be motivated to implement the service providing systems of Tadokoro as document service providing systems in order to provide various services for processing document data. Tadokoro discloses that the service providing systems are computer systems that provide various services to users via a communication network (*see Paragraphs [0046] and [0047]*). And Takeda discloses that a local area network connects various document processing devices and computers together (*see Column 2: 14-20*). Thus, as can be seen, the service providing systems of Tadokoro are merely computer systems that provide web server services to users and can be interchanged with document processing devices and computers to provide document services to the users.

Therefore, for at least the reason set forth above, the rejections made under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) with respect to Claims 1 and 7 are proper and therefore, maintained.

In the Remarks, Applicant argues:

b) As agreed during the personal interview, the combination of Tadokoro with Takeda would not have suggested a restriction of services for the document and the user. Further, the combination of Tadokoro with Takeda would not have suggested any restriction on a document because Tadokoro would not have suggested documents and Takeda would not have suggested

any restriction. Therefore, even if combined, the combination of Tadokoro with Takeda would not have suggested a combination of all of the features recited in claims 1 and 7.

Examiner's response:

b) Examiner disagrees. Applicant's arguments are not persuasive for at least the following reasons:

First, with respect to the Applicant's assertion that agreement was made during the personal interview conducted on April 20, 2009, the Examiner respectfully submits that Claim 1 and the cited prior art were discussed. However, no agreement was reached with respect to the claims and the cited prior art.

Second, with respect to the Applicant's assertion that the combination of Tadokoro with Takeda would not have suggested a restriction of services for the document and the user, as previously pointed out in the Non-Final Rejection (mailed on 03/30/2009) and further clarified hereinafter, the Examiner respectfully submits that the Examiner acknowledges, in the 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) rejections of the claims, that Tadokoro only discloses a restriction value table expressing restrictions on execution of services based on user information and not document services. Thus, as discussed in the Examiner's response (a) hereinabove, those of ordinary skill in the art would be motivated to combine the teachings of Tadokoro and Takeda to provide various services for processing document data and thereby, those of ordinary skill in the art would readily implement the restriction value table expressing restrictions on execution of document services based on user information rather than web server services.

Therefore, for at least the reasons set forth above, the rejections made under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) with respect to Claims 1 and 7 are proper and therefore, maintained.

Conclusion

11. **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL.** Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of this final action.

12. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the Examiner should be directed to Qing Chen whose telephone number is 571-270-1071. The Examiner can normally be reached on Monday through Thursday from 7:30 AM to 4:00 PM. The Examiner can also be reached on alternate Fridays.

If attempts to reach the Examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the Examiner's supervisor, Wei Zhen, can be reached on 571-272-3708. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the TC 2100 Group receptionist whose telephone number is 571-272-2100.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

/Q. C./

Examiner, Art Unit 2191

/Wei Y Zhen/

Supervisory Patent Examiner, Art Unit 2191